DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2734/303604.01
Application No.: 10/646,646
Office Action Dated: July 5, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 4 – 19 are pending in the application with claim 1 being the independent claim. Claims 1, and 4 – 19 stand rejected. Applicants amend claim 1, as a result claims 1, and 4 – 19 are pending.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 4 – 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,099,932 ("Frenkel"). Applicants traverse these rejections.

With respect to claim 1, the Examiner stated in an Office Action that the limitation, an application programming interface that is configured to track changes to the data made by the application programs and to register specific application programs for notifications that indicate changes to specific data, "is not disclosed either in the dependent or independent claims [and] [t]here is no mention [sic] of configuring the application program interface to track changes to the data and to register specific application programs for notifications." (Office Action dated July 5, 2007 at page 9). Applicants disagree. For example claim 1 as submitted on May 7, 2007 stated "an application programming interface that enables application programs to access all of the services and capabilities of the storage platform and to access the data described in the schemas, and is configured to track changes to the data made by the application programs and to register specific application programs for notifications that indicate changes to specific data." (See, e.g., Reply to Office Action dated May, 7, 2007 at claim 1)(Emphasis added).

Additionally the Examiner stated that "[e]ven [if] [sic] the claims would have recited such [a] [sic] limitation, the specification does not provide [a] [sic] basis for that limitation. In fact, the specification states [sic] that the change tracking mechanism implemented within the data store provides the ability to track changes to the data store." (Office Action dated July 5, 2007 at page 9). Applicants have amended claim 1 to clarify the claims, and Applicants submit that the limitations are supported by the specification. For example, "[t]he data store 302 also provides a set of application programming interfaces 312 to expose the capabilities of the data store 302 to other storage platform components and application

programs" (Application at paragraph [0080]), and the storage platform API 322, for example can be configured to allow applications to register for notifications when changes are made to the data. (See, e.g., paragraphs [0542] through [0553]).

Furthermore, Applicants have reviewed the Office Action and submit that Frenkel fails to teach or suggest at least an API configured to register specific application programs for notifications that indicate changes to specific data. In the rejection, the Examiner stated that col. 6, lines 24 – 31 anticipate an API configured to register specific application programs for notifications that indicate changes to specific data. Applicants have reviewed this portion of Frenkel, and submit that there is no mention of registering an application program for a notification service based on changes to specific data. Additionally, Applicants have reviewed the Examiner's remarks with regard to this limitation and submit that the Examiner has not addressed the above mentioned claim limitation as required by 37 C.F.R §1.104(C)(2). (See Office Action dated July 5, 2007, at page 3 – 4). Applicants submit that since the limitations were submitted in the response filed May 5, 2007, and were not addressed by the Examiner, the finality of the rejection is improper, and should be withdrawn. (See, e.g., C.F.R. § 113(b), "the examiner must … *state all grounds* of rejection then considered applicable to the claims in the application, clearly stating the reasons in support thereof.") Additionally, since each and every element of the claims is not taught or suggested by the cited art, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection to claim 1.

Insomuch as claims 4 – 19 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, they too patentably define over the cited art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections to claims 4 – 19.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-2734/303604.01
Application No.: 10/646,646
Office Action Dated: July 5, 2007

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

Applicants request the Examiner reconsider the rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance of all the claims.

Date: September 5, 2007

/David M. Platz/
David M. Platz
Registration No. 60,013

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439